

1. Initiator		2. Type of Review		3. RID Number
Name	Feodoroff, Barry	<input type="checkbox"/>	General Document Review	00200-103
Organization	LMSMSS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PDR, CDR, ABR , PPR (circle)	
Phone	861-2233	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____	
Fax				
5a. Doc. Number	84K00200	6. Doc. Name	System Level Specification (SLS)	
5a. Doc. Revision	Pre-Release 1			
6. Name of RID Team		SLS RID Review Team		
7. Problem				
<p>Paragraphs 2.2.2.1 System: Under subparagraph 2.2.2.1.5 thru 2.2.2.1.9, don't these paragraphs present the response of the CLCS system to inputs from the GSE. Aren't these examples of portion of a user application software package that is appropriate for an End Item Manager?</p>				
8. Recommendation				
<p>Move contents of these paragraphs under 2.2.6 User Application Requirements.</p>				
9. Impact if recommendation not implemented				
<p>Unclear CLCS requirements.</p>				
<div style="text-align: right;"> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 40%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 60%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; font-size: small;"> Initiator - Signature Submission Date </div>				
10. Team Recommendation		11. Action Required		
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Study <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn <input type="checkbox"/> Deferred to CLCS CCB Screening Panel Comments <p>See Attachment.</p> <p>RID Team Manager - Signature _____</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Update Document <input type="checkbox"/> Study <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____ Comments		
12. Final RID Closure Action		13. Additional Comments/Notes		
<input type="checkbox"/> RID to be incorporated in next revision <input type="checkbox"/> RID to be incorporated in other (specify) <p>RID Team Manager - Signature _____</p>				

Due NO LATER THAN April 30, 1997

Response Attachment 200-103

The problem statement in this RID requests a change that is believed by the CLCS design team to be invalid for the following reasons:

1. Paragraph 2.2.2.1.5 refers to a system end to end response from a Gateway through the DDP to a CCP and back to the output of the Gateway. Only one portion of the requirement relates to Application SW.
2. Paragraph 2.2.2.1.6 refers to a system end to end response from a Gateway through the DDP to a CCP and back to the output of the Gateway. Only one portion of the requirement relates to Application SW.
3. Paragraph 2.2.2.1.7 refers to a CCP to DDP and return to CCP performance requirement. Only one portion of the requirement relates to Application SW.
4. Paragraph 2.2.2.1.8 refers to a system end to end response from a Gateway through the DDP to a CCP and back to the output of the Gateway. Only one portion of the requirement relates to Application SW.
5. Paragraph 2.2.2.1.9 refers to a system end to end response from a Gateway through the DDP to a CCP and back to the output of the Gateway. Only one portion of the requirement relates to Application SW.

In all of the above cases only a small portion of the end to end response is allocated to an Application. It is felt that the placement of the requirements in the System section of the Performance requirements is appropriate.

In addition, this version of the SLS does not cover User Application SW requirements. User Application performance requirements will appear in a subsequent version of this document.

The RID Management Team agrees with this assessment. The RID is therefore rejected. Thank you for reviewing the SLS and submitting your RID. Even though we rejected this RID, your input is valuable and we appreciate it.